

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XI.

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1918

No. 26

MAY 9 1918
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN
LIBRARY

Columbia University Summer Session

July 8—August 16, 1918

GENERAL LINGUISTICS—

s102 Introduction to Linguistic Science Professor Sturtevant

GREEK—

s1 Elementary Course Professor Macurdy

s2 Xenophon Professor Macurdy

s3 Homer, Iliad Professor Sturtevant

s105 Informal Lectures on the History of Greek Philosophy Professor Shorey

s153 Greek Life and Thought Professor Van Hook

LATIN—

sX1 Elementary Course Professor Demarest

sX2 Caesar, Gallic War Dr. Messer

sX3 Elementary Latin and Caesar (Direct Method) Miss Wye

sY1 Vergil, Aeneid Professor Demarest

sY2 Cicero, Selected Orations Dr. Messer

sZ Prose Composition Dr. Messer

s6 Horace, Odes and Epodes Professor Sturtevant

s9 Prose Composition Professor Ogle

s13 Vergil, Eclogues and Georgics Professor Van Hook

s39 Prose Composition—Advanced Course Professor Moore

s105 Lucretius Professor McCrea

s122 Horace, Satires and Epistles Professor Shorey

s123 Cicero, his Life, Ideals, and Permanent Influence Professor McCrea

s134 Tacitus, Histories Professor Moore

s141 Cicero's Verrine Orations (Direct Method) Miss Wye

s147 The Literary Heritage of the Middle Ages Professor Ogle

For further information address
FRANK D. FACKENTHAL, Secretary,
Columbia University, New York City



NOTHING SUCCEEDS LIKE SUCCESSS



D'OOGE'S LATIN FOR BEGINNERS

secured its initial success because of the author's name, Benjamin L. D'Ooge—widely known as a teacher, scholar, and skilfull textbook writer. Adoption after adoption has followed the recognition of the value of "Latin for Beginners", and now over 3000 schools are using it.

Is your school one of the 3000?



GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

New York



EASY LATIN READING FOR BEGINNERS

This two-book course for beginners differs from the conventional introduction to Latin in that the preparation it offers is simpler and more gradual. When used in the High School, both books can be mastered in the first year.

The author is H. C. NUTTING, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Latin, University of California.

NUTTING'S LATIN PRIMER

Interesting dialogue and narrative are developed early in the study; sight-reading, oral work and Latin pronunciation receive special attention. Throughout, frequent reference is made to English usage.

The book is based on the *gradatim* plan.

NUTTING'S FIRST LATIN READER

Edition with, or without, English-Latin exercises.

The material in this reader is full of human interest; the 140 lessons present stories of early American history, two simplified narratives from Caesar, and selections from Nepos, Suetonius, Sallust and Cicero.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. XI

NEW YORK, MAY 6, 1918

No. 26

SIR ARTHUR EVANS ON ARCHAEOLOGY

For 1916 Sir Arthur Evans, well known for his excavations in Crete, was President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. At the meeting of this Association, held at Newcastle-on-Tyne, in that year, he delivered a most interesting and valuable address entitled *New Archaeological Light on the Origins of Civilization in Europe*, which was printed in full in *Science*, September 22 and 29, 1916.

In his opening paragraphs, Sir Arthur Evans has much to say of the value of archaeology. Thus, on page 400, he says that archaeology

has reconstituted the successive stages of whole fabrics of former civilization, the very existence of which was formerly unsuspected. Even in later periods, archaeology, as a dispassionate witness, has been continually checking, supplementing and illustrating written history.

Again, he says (401):

It will be found, moreover, that such investigations have at times a very practical bearing on future developments. In connection with the traces of Roman occupation I have recently, indeed, had occasion to point out that the section of the great Roman road that connected the valleys of the Po and Save across the lowest pass of the Julian Alps, and formed part of the main avenue of communication between the western and the eastern provinces of the empire, has only to be restored in railway shape to link together a system of not less value to ourselves and our Allies. For we should thus secure, via the Simplon and northern Italy, a new and shorter overland route to the east, in friendly occupation throughout, which is to-day diverted by unnatural conditions past Vienna and Budapest. At a time when Europe is parcelled out by less cosmopolitan interests the evidence of antiquity here restores the true geographical perspective.

Sir Arthur Evans speaks next (401) of the extent to which archaeology has "redressed the balance where certain aspects of the ancient world have been brought into unequal prominence, it may be, by mere accidents of literary style".

In other cases again, as for example, in the case of Magna Graecia and Sicily, written records carry us but a very short way. Here we must depend largely, if not mainly, on the results of excavations and on the study of the magnificent coinage (401).

Take the case of Roman Britain. Had the lost books of Ammianus relating to Britain been preserved

we might have had, in his rugged style, some partial sketch of the province as it existed in the age of its most complete Romanization. As it is, so far as historians are concerned, we are left in almost complete darkness. Here, again, it is through archaeological research that light has penetrated, and thanks to the thoroughness and persistence of our own investigators, town sites such as Silchester in Roman Britain have been more completely uncovered than those of any other province.

Sir Arthur Evans speaks next (401-402) in some detail of the continuous work of exploration and research carried out by the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle, and the valuable publications of this Society.

The British Vallum, it is now realized, must be looked at with perpetual reference to other frontier lines such as the Germanic or the Rhaetian lines; local remains of every kind have to be correlated with similar discoveries throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire.

This attitude in the investigation of the remains of Roman Britain—the promotion of which owes so much to the energy and experience of Professor Hawley—has in recent years conducted excavation to specially valuable results. The work at Corbridge, the ancient Corstopitum, begun in 1906, and continued down to the autumn of 1914, has already uncovered throughout a large part of its area the largest urban center—civil as well as military in character—on the line of the Wall, and the principal store-base of its stations. Here, together with well-built granaries, workshops, and barracks, and such records of civic life as are supplied by sculptured stones and inscriptions, and the double discovery of hoards of gold coins, has come to light a spacious and massively constructed stone building, apparently a military storehouse, worthy to rank beside the bridge-piers of the North Tyne, among the most imposing monuments of Roman Britain. There is much here, indeed, to carry our thoughts far beyond our insular limits. On this, as on so many other sites along the Wall, the inscriptions and reliefs take us very far afield. We mark the grave-stone of a man of Palmyra, an altar of the Tyrian Hercules—its Phoenician Baal—a dedication to a pantheistic goddess of Syrian religion and the rayed effigy of the Persian Mithra. So, too, in the neighborhood of Newcastle itself, as elsewhere on the wall, there was found an altar of Jupiter Dolichenus, the old Anatolian God of the Double Axe, the male form of the divinity once worshipped in the prehistoric Labyrinth of Crete. Nowhere are we more struck than in this remote extremity of the empire with the heterogeneous religious elements, often drawn from its far eastern borders, that before the days of the final advent of Christianity, Roman dominion had been instrumental in diffusing.

Sir Arthur Evans next remarks (403) that "Crete of four thousand years ago must unquestionably be regarded as the birth-place of our European civilization in its higher form". But, he adds, "are we appreciably nearer to the fountain-head?"

He then considers in detail the archaeological discoveries made in recent years in Southwestern Europe. These discoveries definitely prove a high level of artistic attainment in Southwestern Europe, "at a modest estimate some ten thousand years earlier than the most ancient monuments of Egypt or Chaldaea!" There is no space, however, to follow him through his discussion of this matter, or in his discussion of the culture of the Reindeer Age, further than to make the following quotation (405):

For the first time, moreover, we find the productions of his (=man's) art rich in human subjects. At Cogul the sacral dance is performed by women clad from the waist downwards in well-cut gowns, while in a rock-shelter of Alpera, where we meet with the same skirted ladies, their dress is supplemented by flying sashes. On the rock painting of the Cueva de la Vieja, near the same place, women are seen with still longer gowns rising to their bosoms. We are already a long way from Eve!

It is this great Alpera fresco which, among all those discovered, has afforded most new elements. Here are depicted whole scenes of the chase in which bowmen—up to the time of these last discoveries unknown among Palaeolithic representations—take a leading part, though they had not as yet the use of quivers. Some are dancing in the attitude of the Australian Corroborees. Several wear plumed headdresses, and the attitudes at times are extraordinarily animated. What is specially remarkable is that some of the groups of these Spanish-rock paintings show dogs or jackals accompanying the hunters, so that the process of domesticating animals had already begun. Hafted axes are depicted as well as cunningly shaped throwing sticks.

Sir Arthur Evans passes on to say that this type of culture is now seen to have been very wide-spread. It held sway, for example, in Poland, in a large part of Russia, in Bohemia, along the upper course of the Danube and of the Rhine, and all the way to Southwestern Britain and Southeastern Spain. Again we must quote (405):

Beyond the Mediterranean, moreover, it fits on under varying conditions to a parallel form of culture, the remains of which are by no means confined to the Cis-Saharan zone, where incised figures occur of animals like the long-horned buffalo (*Bubalus antiquus*) and others long extinct in that region. This southern branch may eventually be found to have a large extension. The nearest parallels to the finer class of rock-carvings as seen in the Dordogne are, in fact, to be found among the more ancient specimens of similar work in South Africa, while the rock-paintings of Spain find their best analogies among the Bushmen.

Of particular interest is the demonstration, on pages 406-407, that the culture of the Reindeer Age cannot be regarded as the property of a single race.

C. K.

(To be concluded)

AN OBVIOUS MEANS OF INCREASING THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS

Some of you are weary of lamentations over the alleged decline of classical studies. I agree with you, and I assure you that there are no lamentations in this paper. Still more of you are weary of new methods of teaching the Classics; the chance of finding a serviceable method that is still new to the profession as a whole is very slight. I have no new method to suggest.

Nevertheless I am convinced that we have fewer students of the Classics than we ought to have, fewer than we might easily have, and that we teachers of the Classics are chiefly responsible. Usually a student's attitude toward the Classics and the amount of time he will devote to classical study are determined by impressions gained from the first classical language to be studied. In particular the question whether or not he shall study the other classical tongue, if such a question is raised at all, is inevitably decided largely on the basis of the language and literature with which he has already been working. The amount of study that is now being devoted to the Classics must depend, to a considerable extent, upon the question whether boys and girls are attracted by the first classical literature that is put before them. There is no doubt that they are so attracted. Cicero's eloquence and Vergil's sublime poetry have always won students for the later parts of the Latin course and for Greek. My thesis, however, is that Greek has more drawing power than Latin, and that we cannot get and keep as many students as we should have until we teach Greek to every student who comes to us at all.

I need not prove to you the superiority of Greek literature to Latin literature. Most of you who teach Latin would have chosen to teach Greek if the choice had been yours. Of greater moment for our immediate purpose is the fact that educated people in general have more respect for Greek than for Latin literature. In support of this assertion I wish to cite two witnesses. When it was proposed recently to abolish the requirement of a year's Latin in Columbia College, a teacher of a modern language, who has always been known as a friend of the Classics, announced that he would not oppose the change, because, he said, a year of Latin could give very little knowledge of Hellenic culture; and he considered Hellenism to be the part of ancient civilization a knowledge of which is vitally important.

My second witness is Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, who, on November 16, 1916 refreshed himself from the labors of the presidential campaign by addressing the American Academy and the National Institute of Arts and Sciences. In the course of his remarks, which ranged over many literatures ancient and modern, he had some very harsh things to say about Latin literature. Later in the evening he praised Greek literature and especially Homer; "I prefer", he said,

"even a dozen lines of the Greek epic to all but a half dozen lines of the English drama *Troilus and Cresida*". I do not altogether agree with the opinions he expressed, and for that reason I have not quoted his rather sweeping condemnation of Latin literature; I cite his words merely as evidence that we may expect from such men as ex-President Roosevelt more support for the study of Greek than for the study of Latin.

But we are not now so much concerned with the tastes of mature men as with the needs and the likes of High School students; for it is in the High School that boys and girls usually decide for or against the study of the Classics.

One great difficulty with the study of English is that much of our best literature is too 'old' for boys and girls. To get the meat out of our best authors, you need to know a great deal about life, and also about the earlier writers—English, French, Italian, and classical—to whom they constantly refer. It is, of course, possible for High School students to get at the meaning of Shakespeare and Milton by means of commentaries; but the net result of such study is too often a distaste for good literature.

Now the involved, indirect, allusive character of much English literature is an inheritance from the Latin. Latin literature also is sophisticated, artificial, indirect. To find literature that is at the same time great and childlike we are, for the most part, driven back to Greek. Homer is not too 'old' for anyone who knows the meaning of life and death, and love and hate. Herodotus, the Greek dramatists, even Plato built upon the solid rock of human nature; they did not rely upon learned and literary allusions as the great Roman and English writers have usually done.

One result of the simplicity of Greek literature is its ease. Most teachers of Latin will agree that Caesar is too difficult for second year pupils; and yet there is no satisfactory substitute for Caesar. There are easier authors, it is true, but they are scarcely worth reading. In Greek there is no such difficulty; the *Anabasis* is as much easier than the *Commentaries* as it is more interesting and more vital. In still greater degree Homer is easier than Vergil, and Plato than Cicero.

But, some will reply, the simple, easy style of certain Greek writers is more than counterbalanced by the difficulty of the Greek language itself. The truth of the matter is that Greek is no more difficult than Latin. There is nothing in Greek syntax that will compare in difficulty with the Latin characteristic and temporal clauses, nothing so confusing as the numerous and inconsistent meanings of the Latin ablative and the Latin subjunctive. It must be admitted that a Greek vocabulary is harder to acquire than a Latin vocabulary, and consequently it is impossible to maintain that Greek is on the whole an easier language than Latin. But neither is it more difficult than Latin. The simple style of the Greek

writers does, then, really make the study of Greek literature easier than the study of Latin literature.

Still more important is the fact that the spirit of the Greek writers is, as a rule, more in harmony with modern ideals than is that of the Romans. Caesar's frank militarism has long been repellent and will, we may hope, be still more so in the future. I grant that Xenophon's ethics were little if any superior, but, at any rate, the Ten Thousand did not clamp the yoke of a foreign power upon the necks of a weaker nation. Every teacher of Vergil knows that students are puzzled by Aeneas's tearfulness and shocked by his treatment of Dido. Cicero's braggadocio is tolerated by young America only on the ground that a man who lived so long ago probably did not know any better. These difficulties, except for the first named, are superficial; Cicero, instead of being a mere braggart, is rather to be considered a statesman of the first rank, probably the most influential of all writers of prose in the world's history, and a wonderfully sympathetic and human man, while it is only the immature reader who can find effeminacy and fickleness in Vergil's hero. Nevertheless young people do find these difficulties in appreciating High School Latin. I do not know of any such barriers in the way of appreciating Homer or Plato's *Apology*.

There is nothing novel about the observations I have been making. The superiority and the superior attractiveness of Greek have always been recognized. The contention has been that both languages should be studied by all persons of intelligence, and if a boy or girl is to study Greek in the end there is no harm in his studying Latin first. As long as classical study had control of the Schools, there was less harm in acting on this theory, although even then many a boy missed the enthusiasm for ancient literature that he might have had if he had read Homer before Caesar and Cicero.

Now the situation is different. The professions of law, medicine, and engineering require a long technical preparation, and young persons of moderate means must begin the process early. There are, besides, many subjects, such as history, sociology, physical science, of which children are now given a taste before they leave the Grammar School, subjects which appeal to the best there is in them and which they rightly wish to pursue further. Under these circumstances all but a very few young people are convinced that they have time for only one classical language at most. If we wish to hold as many of them as possible we have got to give them the most attractive material we have, namely Greek.

If we do this, we may reasonably expect in the end to increase the study of Latin also. For the whole classical field is really one. It is easier to understand Greek literature without Latin than to understand Latin literature without Greek—to do the latter thing is really impossible; but we may be sure that most students who become thoroughly interested in Greek will find a way to study Latin also.

A great deal of ingenuity has recently been devoted to proving that Roman civilization and the Latin language are the source of very much in our modern life. The close kinship of Rome to the modern world has been appealed to as a motive for studying Latin. The question arises whether there is a similar argument for the study of Greek. I think there is. The most valuable part of the civilization which Rome passed on to the modern world came from Greece. Is it not better to study the origin of European civilization and the period of its most rapid development than to study the first stage of the great decline which began with Rome and continued through the Middle Ages? Our world is more nearly akin to ancient Greece than to Rome or in fact to any other place and time in all history.

Then what can we do about it? I have three suggestions.

(1) The reason usually given for the elimination of Greek from the High Schools is that small classes are too expensive. I do not see any immediate way of meeting this argument in small High Schools. But in Schools with three or more sections in first year Latin it should be possible to have one of the sections begin Greek instead of Latin. This would involve no extra expense if one third of the students elected to study Greek. The success of the plan, then, would depend on the persuasive powers of the principal and the head of the classical department. I should say, however, that any teacher could persuade one student out of three to take Greek instead of Latin.

(2) Many Colleges require Latin for entrance but no Greek. Some of these allow the substitution of Greek for Latin, but others do not. As long as no students apply for entrance with Greek and without Latin, this makes little difference, except that it tends to perpetuate the present neglect of Greek in the High Schools. It is to be hoped that no College will refuse to accept entrance Greek in place of entrance Latin when it is offered. Provision for such cases should be made as soon as possible.

(3) The argument advanced above as to High School students applies equally to College freshmen. We are more likely to hold a man for classical study if we put him at Greek as soon as he enters College than if we give him an additional year of Latin. If possible we should have him study both Greek and Latin; but if a choice has to be made Greek should always be preferred. Even if a student enters College with four years of Latin and no Greek, it is better for him to begin Greek than to continue Latin for another year. If he gets a fair start with his Greek he will probably elect some Latin before he leaves College; but if he takes freshman Latin and no Greek, the chances are that he will drop classical study at the end of the freshman or, at most, the sophomore year.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEWS

A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy. By Evelyn Spring. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 28, 135-224. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1917).

It is unfortunate that Miss Spring chose the present title for this essay, which was originally called *Quo Modo Aeschylus in Tragoediis Suis Res Antecedentis Exposuerit*, since the latter title is far more suggestive of the content of the work. Also, the opening sentences cause one to fear that Miss Spring does not always differentiate exposition and the development of the plot by unveiling the past. She says (135):

Exposition is that part of dramatic construction which deals with the unfolding of the plot. Every dramatist must provide sufficient elucidation of the past to render intelligible the ever-advancing action of the present. He may complete the necessary explanation in a few lines, or he may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, by revealing various circumstances that are antecedent to the action of the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective. The meaning of the first statement is rendered obscure, if not incorrect, by the fact that the phrase "unfolding of the plot" usually means the development of the plot or action; whereas exposition is the explanation, for the sake of the audience, of the events which lead to the unfolding of the plot. While the author may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, the revelation of "various circumstances that are antecedent to the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective" is not necessarily exposition. If it were, the revelation that Oedipus is the murderer of Laius would be exposition, and so, likewise, would be the dénouement of most Latin comedies. This fundamental error actually results in Miss Spring doing herself an injustice. For instance, under the heading, The Gradual Exposition of the Past, she shows in an excellent manner the dramatic value of the gradual unveiling of the past for purposes of characterization, dramatic irony, etc. (189-199); but she calls this procedure, at times, the gradual method of exposition and distributive exposition, although she tacitly proves that it is not exposition. At other times, she recognizes the difference, for she points out that lines 227-247 of the choral ode in the *Agamemnon*, dealing with the death of Iphigenia, are not primarily expository in character, but furnish "the foundation for Clytaemnestra's later defence of her crime" (205). Thus, if the reader keeps in mind that the purpose of Miss Spring's study is to show how Aeschylus unveiled the past, and realizes that she uses the term exposition in a rather loose way, he will find many interesting pages in the essay; but the reader will be disappointed if the present title leads him to expect an account of the development of the art of exposition in relation to the point of attack in all Greek tragedy.

Miss Spring discusses the plays of Aeschylus in greater detail than those of Sophocles and Euripides in order to emphasize the excellence of the Aeschylean technique. She holds (137) that Aeschylus was not only more interested in the technical problems than either Sophocles or Euripides, but, as far as exposition is concerned, he was more successful in dramatic construction.

We must say that it hardly seems possible to form any judgment in regard to the amount of interest in technical details felt by each of the dramatists. In regard to the success of Aeschylus in the matter of exposition, if by exposition is meant the explanation of the situation necessary to understand the development of the play, the present writer agrees that Aeschylus is shown to be clear, and the element of clearness is most important. However, if Miss Spring refers to the unveiling of the past as a means of causing the action to develop, it must be said that the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is a finer play in this respect than the *Agamemnon*, which Miss Spring says (187),

more than any other extant play of Aeschylus, reveals the advantages of the distributive mode of explication for purposes of suspense and climax.

But, after all, most of the action in the *Agamemnon* depends upon present conditions and events, whereas almost all the action in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* depends upon the disclosure of the past, and the manner in which Sophocles overcame the difficulties which beset him is little short of marvellous. Thus we cannot agree with Miss Spring in her view that Sophocles was very careless in not explaining in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* why the man who witnessed the murder of Laius is reported to have said that Laius was slain by robbers. Sophocles undoubtedly followed the excellent procedure of all dramatists, who, when they cannot offer a good explanation for an element in the plot, offer no explanation. His suppression of this detail of the past shows keen judgment. Only the critic, not the spectator, objects.

Miss Spring deals first with the elucidation of the past in the trilogy, showing that Aeschylus did not think of each play as unrelated to the others, although (155)

he was careful to make each play an intelligible dramatic entity without reference to the others of the group. He further provided in each a summary or summaries of preceding dramas.

It is also shown how each play prepares for the future events in following plays. These conclusions drawn from the *Orestia* are confirmed by an examination of other connected groups of plays.

The discussion of the elucidation of the past in the *parados* or prologue is then taken up, and it is found (181) that

the situation at the beginning of all the extant plays of Aeschylus is clear, provided that it is admitted that the poet presupposed a general knowledge of the myths that he used as foundation for his plot.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the essay is that in which Miss Spring shows in detail the amount of pre-knowledge on the part of the audience assumed by the playwright. Professor Post's view that the spectator's acquaintance with the myth was a disadvantage to the dramatist is successfully refuted¹.

The reason for the repetition of expository details is found to be, in part, the necessity of acquainting the chorus or certain characters with facts already brought out before their entrance. We must insist, however, that such repetition as Miss Spring describes on page 188 is not always for the benefit of the audience. If the spectator already knows a fact brought out in some scene, to inform a character of that fact is not exposition but is a means of developing the action. Miss Spring finds a general explanation of this practice in the peculiar structure of Greek tragedy, which, being "concerned only with the results of a great calamity. . . . must deal exclusively with the past" (188). But to repeat information for the benefit of the audience or for any other purpose is not peculiar to Greek tragedy any more than it is to drama which deals exclusively with the present. All dramatists repeat certain details, sometimes for exposition, and sometimes to advance the plot. It would be impossible to write a play or to have it understood by the audience without repetition and even insistence on certain points. The fact that Greek drama deals with the past makes it necessary to unveil the past; but it does not make repetition of the unveiling necessary. Repetition in all drama is due to other causes set forth by Mr. Clayton Hamilton in the chapter of his book to which Miss Spring refers on page 187; and better reasons are to be found in that chapter than those to which she refers.

In the selection of expository details (210 ff.), Miss Spring believes that Aeschylus, of whom alone it was characteristic to neglect details of minor importance, was governed in his selection by the aim to emphasize only those points which would make his plays successful from a dramatic point of view, and not in order to indulge in an ingenious manipulation of an old plot or in subtle characterization. He also differs from Sophocles and Euripides in that he handled the exposition in such a way as to give a problematical aspect to the past. This part of Miss Spring's work is very convincing; but we cannot agree with her in her criticism of Sophocles for failing to suppress the announcement of the death penalty in the first scene of the *Antigone* (199 f.). She holds that Sophocles here, as usual, subordinated the principle of suspense to his supreme interest in characterization, and that a poet whose energies were primarily directed toward effective dramatic construction would have kept the audience in ignorance of the penalty until line 460. But exactly the opposite is true. If we did not know the specific penalty attached to the burial of Polynices,

¹Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 16 (1905), 15-61.

our interest and our suspense would be immeasurably decreased. There would simply be a shock of surprise were the announcement made at line 460, and every dramatist knows that only in the rarest cases, and certainly not in this one, must suspense be sacrificed to surprise. The opening scene of the Antigone is a model of exposition for reasons of artistic technique which Miss Spring fails to discuss at any time.

We may say, in passing, that we cannot agree with the view that much of the exposition in Greek tragedy, such as information as to the personnel of the chorus, the place of the action and the point of attack, could be dispensed with in a modern play, because it would already have been communicated to the spectators in the program (169). That modern playwrights do not dispense with such exposition is proof that they do not trust the audience to memorize these details from the program.

Miss Spring's contention that "Sophocles, like Scribe, disposed of many necessary explanations early in his plays", and that "Euripides rarely resorted to gradual elucidation" is valid (200). She also shows that Aeschylus used the gradual method of disclosing antecedent conditions more than did Sophocles (191). Beyond the explanation of the Sophoclean procedure, as she believes she sees it exemplified in the Antigone, no reason is offered for the different practice on the part of the later playwrights. We venture the theory that this difference is due to the gradual recession of the point of attack away from the dénouement—a phenomenon which can be traced with no little exactitude from the earliest to the latest extant Greek tragedies. Miss Spring is apparently unaware of the steps in this extremely important development in the structure of tragedy, although she compares the point of attack of modern plays with that of Greek plays (166, 188 ff.), and is fully cognizant of the fact that "every Greek tragedy is, to a greater or less degree, a backward-written drama" (203). Now the tragedies of Aeschylus are "backward-written" to a far greater degree than are those of Sophocles or Euripides, because the Aeschylean point of attack is closer to the dénouement than is that of the later dramatists. There are more events and greater development of the plot in the average play of the later playwrights than are included in the scope of an Aeschylean tragedy. Thus, while the point of attack in all three Electra plays is apparently the same in point of time, there is a much greater development of plot in the later plays than in the Choephoroe. Especially is this true of Sophocles's Electra. This is a natural development in dramatic art; and the place of the point of attack is of the utmost importance in the matter of exposition and unveiling the past. Furthermore, the later dramatists discarded the trilogy on one subject, but they have almost as many events and as much action in one play as Aeschylus would have in two or three plays. Therefore, both Sophocles and Euripides had to deal with the present action and events, whereas

Aeschylus not only could but had to hark back to the past more than they did. Thus we cannot admit that the problems of successful exposition must have been baffling when drama was still in its embryonic phase (181). The baffling thing was to introduce action; and, when action was introduced, and when more events in the present had been placed between the point of attack and the dénouement, then exposition became difficult. It is only when the point of attack recedes from the dénouement in order to include events of the past, when it has receded temporarily, so to speak, as in the Shakespearean form of drama, that exposition becomes easy. But, as we have shown in regard to the Electra plays, the point of attack remained at the same place in the story, but much more material was introduced by Sophocles and Euripides between the point of attack and the dénouement. Thus they had just as much of the past to explain and much more of the present to deal with. The past, therefore, had to be explained quickly so that the action could develop and attention could be centered on the present and the future. That is the reason why "Sophocles, like Scribe, disposed of many necessary explanations early in his plays". As Miss Spring points out (168), the Greek dramatist was no less handicapped than the modern playwright who plunges *in medias res*, as far as the clear exposition of the past is concerned.

But Miss Spring apparently fails to recognize that there are different degrees of plunging *in medias res*, and that Aeschylus is inclined to plunge *in ultimas res* in his separate plays, as far as development of the plot is concerned, and to allow the action to develop through the trilogy.

Furthermore, these may be the reasons which caused Euripides to surrender to the baffling problem of exposition and write a formal prologue to set forth the necessary facts immediately. Miss Spring does not discuss at any length the Euripidean prologue as a means of exposition. One has to arrive at her estimate of this device by collecting her *obiter dicta* on the subject. She says that she does not know why Euripides chose an undramatic introduction for his plays (186), and that to consider an Euripidean prologue, in general, an essential part of the rest of the play is an injustice to the poet (187). We agree that the expository part of the prologue is not very dramatic, as a rule; but the prologue, taken as a whole with its foreshadowing and the suspense it arouses, is extremely dramatic³. Miss Spring holds that the prologue is necessary to understand the Ion and the Bacchae. But Lessing pointed out long ago that the value of the Euripidean prologue is not to be judged by the question as to whether the play can be understood without it⁴. Furthermore, Miss Spring makes the statement (181-182) that

³I hope to publish evidence in favor of this view in the near future.

⁴Hamburgische Dramaturgie, Stücke, 148, 149.

Euripides is perhaps rightly censured for introducing as a speaker of the prologue a character who takes no part in the action of the play after his disappearance at the end of the monologue.

We do not know what Euripidean critics Miss Spring has in mind as having censured Euripides for this practice, but to do so is to censure him for a procedure which he follows only in three of his sixteen plays, counting the *Supplices*, which has a monologue as an opening scene. This is, therefore, rather meticulous criticism and does not do justice to the poet. In the *Alcestis* and the *Troades* the speaker of the monologue remains for the ensuing dialogue. In the *Medea*, the *Electra*, and the *Supplices*, a secondary character of the play is the speaker. In the *Bacchae*, the *Helen*, the *Andromache*, the *Heracleidae*, the *Hercules Furens*, the *Phoenissae*, the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and the *Electra* the formal monologue is spoken by a principal character. Only in the *Ion*, the *Hecuba*, and the *Hippolytus* is the procedure found for which Miss Spring would censure the playwright. In the plays of Sophocles, there are only two protatatic characters, Athena in the *Ajax* and the Bondwoman in the *Trachiniae*; and they carry on dialogue with principals. On the other hand, in both of the plays of Aeschylus which open with a monologue, the Agamemnon and the *Eumenides*, the speaker of the monologue does not appear again.

These are facts that should have been brought out by Miss Spring, for the effect of expository scenes is greatly altered by the identity and the importance of the characters. Thus the opening of the *Antigone* is much more dramatic with Antigone and Ismene giving the exposition during a dramatic conflict which constitutes the exciting incident of the plot, than it would be if Ismene and a protatatic character gave the necessary information in mere narrative dialogue. Miss Spring should also discuss more fully in regard to each dramatist the question as to whether the exposition is, as it were, a mere protatatic scene or is combined with an event vital to the plot, as it is in the *Antigone*, or is a striking incident not in strict causal relation to the ensuing action, as in the *Agamemnon*. Thus, while there are many interesting pages in this essay, we cannot say that the study of exposition in Greek tragedy is exhaustive.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

Greek Ideals: A Study of Social Life. By C. Delisle Burns. London: G. Bell & Sons (1917). Pp. 275. \$2.

An ever-growing interest in interpretations in English of ancient Hellas is shown by the wide popular appeal made by numerous books which have appeared in the last few years. It seems worth while briefly to mention some of these interpretations, which are intended not so much for the Greek scholar and the Greek student as for the intelligent public. And I am not now thinking so much of the interesting accounts of the astounding results of archaeological excavations in Greece,

in Asia Minor, and in Crete, as, for example, the work of Schliemann, Dörpfeld, Evans, Hawes, and many others¹.

Special studies have been numerous; e.g. for Homer, the books of Lang and of Leaf²; in antiquities (largely private), the brief, but comprehensive, *Life of the Ancient Greeks*, by Gulick (New York, 1903); in education, the books of Capes, Drever, Freeman, and Walden³; in athletics, Gardiner's useful book, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910)⁴; in economics, Zimmern's valuable work, *The Greek Commonwealth*, Oxford, 1915⁵; in religion, the informative lectures of C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (Cambridge, U. S. A., 1916)⁶; in art and archaeology, Stobart, *The Glory that was Greece* (Philadelphia, 1915)⁷, and Powers's *The Message of Greek Art* (New York, 1915)⁸. Miss Richter's admirable *Guide to the Classical Art Collection in the Metropolitan Museum*, New York, was noticed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.200.

For our indebtedness to ancient Greece, there are the stimulating lectures (some of these apply, however, to Russian conditions, primarily) of Zieliński, *Our Debt to Antiquity* (London, 1900), and Mahaffy's disappointing volume with the title which challenges our interest, *What have the Greeks done for Modern Civilization?* (New York, 1910). For the latter book see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.220-221.

For those who may be fond of historical fiction, which aims to be reasonably veracious as to the ancient background, there are Gaines's *Gorgo* (Boston, 1903), Davis's *A Victor of Salamis* (New York, 1915), and, with less emphasis on the fictional side, Robinson's *Days of Alkibiades* (New York, 1916)⁹.

Studies in Greek literature have been noteworthy. Still deservedly popular is the work of Symonds¹⁰, *Studies of the Greek Poets* (London, 1902). Mackail's *Lectures on Greek Poetry* (London, 1911) in general show discrimination and excellent taste, but the author is a false guide for Pindar¹¹. Extremely helpful are the Columbia University Lectures on Greek Literature (New York, 1912)¹². Valuable interpretations of Euripides are the books of Decharme, Euripides and the Spirit of his Dramas (translated by Loeb; New York, 1906) and Murray, *Euripides and his Age* (New York, 1913)¹³. Students of English literature will find much information in Collins's *Greek Influence on English Poetry* (London, 1910) and the volume entitled *English Literature and the Classics*, edited by Gordon (Oxford, 1912)¹⁴.

¹Beginning with Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age* (Boston, 1897). Compare also Mosso, *The Palaces of Crete and their Builders* (New York, 1907), reviewed by Dr. Shear in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 1.228-229; Hawes, *Crete, the Forerunner of Greece* (New York, 1909), reviewed by Professor K. K. Smith, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.166; Baikie, *The Sea-Kings of Crete* (London, 1910), reviewed by Professor K. K. Smith in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.158-159.

²For a book by Lang, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.109-111; for books by Leaf see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.125-126, 10.62-64.

³See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.118.

⁴See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.100-102.

⁵See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5.117-118.

⁶See *CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, 10.214. For a review by Professor Robinson see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.21-22.

⁷For a review by Professor Robinson see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.29-32.

⁸Reviewed by Professor Jones, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.127.

⁹Students who admire this lover of Greek poetry will be interested in his biography by Horatio F. Brown² (London, 1903).

¹⁰See the review by Professor Shorey, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.93-95.

¹¹Reviewed by Professor Goodell, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.123-124.

¹²For reviews of these books see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 1.5.

¹³77-78. Both these books were reviewed by L. R. Van Hook in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8, 125-127.

But it is with interpretations of the Greek genius and ideals that we are here especially concerned. An early volume in this field was Butcher's *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* (New York, 1893). This contains some good essays but, as the title indicates, it is not a comprehensive treatment. Dickinson's *The Greek View of Life* (9th ed., New York, 1915) has enjoyed amazing popularity. This popularity is, in large measure, deserved, for the book is well written, easily intelligible to the non-classical reader, and is sound, on the whole. And yet Mr. Dickinson's survey could now be greatly improved by a revision of the rather dogmatic discussion of such topics as religion, slavery, economics, women, etc. Livingstone's *The Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us* (Oxford, 1912)¹⁷ has won decided favor in the study of a difficult and elusive subject. Although the Greek scholar will not find the work flawless, unquestionably the writer has shown knowledge, acumen, and judgment in a book which can be recommended to inform the intelligent reader and stimulate the student. I shall mention last a collection of essays, discussions, and lectures edited by Lane Cooper, entitled *Greek Ideals* (New Haven, 1917). This volume promises to be of value in the service of assisting students to a better understanding of Greek culture and civilization.

Let us now turn to the examination of the book under review.

As stated in the Preface, Mr. Burns's purpose is to attempt an analysis of some of the ideals which are usually called Greek (i.e. Athenian). These ideals are moral in the widest sense; little is said of the position of art in Greek life; "even of literature and philosophy we shall speak only in so far as these provide evidence of moral ideals which are typically Greek". The author further states: "The versatility of the Greeks is more emphasized than any single idea such as 'harmony' or 'beauty' to express the Greek ideal. But in all their ideals what is most prominent appears to be sociability".

In the book are 17 short chapters: I-V, Athenian Religion and Festivals; VI, Politics; VII, The Epic Tradition; VIII, The Fifth Century; IX, The Old School; X, Socrates; XI, The Philosophers; XII-XV, Plato; XVI, Aristotle; XVII, The Afterglow.

In Chapters I-V emphasis is placed on the social character of Athenian religion in which activity all the Athenians participated. The great festivals, then, were of very great importance as social activities; e.g. the Anthesteria, Panthenaea, Dionysia, and Eleusinia. Mr. Burns's thesis here is perfectly sound and he is justified in emphasizing it, as all who have any knowledge of ancient Athenian life would agree. It must be confessed, however, that these first five chapters, devoted to religion and the festivals, are of no importance in themselves; they are very sketchy, and much better accounts are readily accessible.

In subsequent discussions Mr. Burns is more at home. The chapter on Politics is good in its comparison with our own of the Greek view of the laws and the *polis*. The gist of the chapter is this: "The Athenian ideal for a political society is autonomy so far as its external contacts are concerned and individual liberty, at least for a few, within an administrative system which is regarded not as a mechanism but as a living organism". The exposition is sound; Mr. Burns, however, is in error, I think, in his repetition and overemphasis throughout of the dogmatic traditional view of the Greek aristocratic conception of individual liberty, e.g. "it seemed essential that liberty and equality should only be the right of a few males" (page 76). See also

¹⁷Reviewed by Professor Shorey in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.132-134.

¹⁸See Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*, and Van Hook, *The Classical Journal* 11.49 ff.

page 109: "Society was conceived only in terms . . . of a small social caste"; 112, "The Athenian citizen might object to doing manual labor"; "A grievous limitation of the Fifth century view of intelligence is in the restriction of the ideal of character to a small number of the male sex". These traditional views, originally taken wholly from the philosophical literature, need to be revised in the light of actuality.

In Chapter VIII, the following points are quite correctly elucidated: (1) the development of individuality, (2) the hatred of tyranny, (3) the life of public action, (4) the stress laid on public speaking and interest therein, (5) the value of bodily development, (6) admiration for the intelligent man but not for the intellectualist, (7) the conception of reserve or control.

Chapter IX, The Old School, is pleasantly written. It is a discussion of the admiration of the Athenian *laudator temporis acti* for the 'good old days'. Aristophanes, of course, is drawn upon heavily in the consideration of such topics as (1) love for country life, (2) admiration for simplicity, (3) affection for animals (compare Xenophon's minor writings), (4) view of women, (5) the decorous and the indecorous, (6) the view of science, (7) the view of practical issues.

The discussion of Socrates¹⁹, although brief, is good. It presents a reasonable outline of the thinker, his ideals, and the apparent inconsistencies of his thoughts, beliefs, and teachings. Is Mr. Burns fair to Xenophon when he says (145-146) in unqualified condemnation, "In all essentials Xenophon's testimony is worthless, not less as to the religious belief and practice of Socrates than as to his character; it is a complete misrepresentation"²⁰.

Some of Plato's views on society as found largely in the Republic form the basis of discussion in Chapters XII-XV. In XVI there is adverse criticism of both Plato and Aristotle for not considering the State in its inevitable international relations. The fact is disappointing, but should we be surprised? Mr. Burns himself would doubtless admit that the international mind is a conception of recent years and just and peaceful international relations are even to-day unhappily far from realization. The author further points out in this chapter Aristotle's great inferiority to Plato as a thinker on social ideals. But one must keep in mind that the two philosophers were thinkers of very different types of mind and divergent interests.

The concluding sentence of the final chapter (The Afterglow) truthfully affirms: "These Greek ideals illuminate our own desires, and the critical study of them may give us many indications of the way in which to deal with the evils of our own day. For liberty is not yet attained in any country, society is not yet one, the love of beauty is still believed to be somewhat improper, and no one yet knows the true value of reasoning".

In conclusion it may be said that Mr. Burns has written a useful and readable book. The author himself modestly states in the Preface that "the book contains no reference which will be new to scholars and no subversively new conclusions drawn from the old evidence", and, further, "in a field so large, even though severely limited, it is almost impossible to satisfy either the requirements of scholars or the expectations of the ordinary reader". While this is quite true, yet the book will be of service and is welcome.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

LARUE VAN HOOK.

¹⁹A recent study of the Athenian philosopher is the book of Cross, *Socrates: The Man and his Mission* (Chicago, 1916), reviewed by Professor English, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 11.84.

²⁰For a sensible discussion giving the opposite view see Baker, *The Classical Journal* 12.293 ff., *An Apologetic for Xenophon's Memorabilia*.